



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,213	08/17/2001	William Webb	25216-0863	5012

30554 7590 03/13/2006
SHEMWELL MAHAMEDI LLP
4880 STEVENS CREEK BOULEVARD
SUITE 201
SAN JOSE, CA 95129

EXAMINER

CHANG, KENT WU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/932,213

Applicant(s)

WEBB ET AL.

Examiner

Kent Chang

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/15/06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/13/06 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted 2/15/06 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

Art Unit: 2675

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boesen (US Patent No. 5,542,721).

Boesen discloses a mobile device having a first segment; a second segment with a first input feature (keypad section 22) moveably coupled to the first segment to move between a contracted position having a reduced length (as shown in Fig.9) and an extended position having a maximum length (as shown in Fig.7) along one axis; a display assembly provided by the first segment, wherein the portion of the display assembly is accessible to contact by a user when the second segment is in the extended position; wherein the second segment overlays the first segment when the second segment is in the contracted position so as to reduce a length of the mobile device as recited in claims 1, 19-21, 27-29, 41, 45-50 (see column 5 lines 23-40 and Figure 7). Obviously, the portion of the first segment being overlaid by the second segment could have varied from none to full length dependent on user's choice, a longer overlaid portion would have lead to a smaller size of the device, while a shorter overlaid portion would have provided more input functions to the user. Furthermore, Boesen includes a pivotable mechanism to allow the user to adjust the angle between the first segment and second segment. However, this function is only for enabling the user to use the device in a manner as a phone handset, and the pivoting operation is performed after the sliding operation, wherein the pivotable mechanism is operative independently from the operation of the sliding operation. It would have been obvious

for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to eliminate such a pivotable mechanism in the device of Boesen so as to provide a device with less parts and a simple operation. Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if remaining elements perform same functions as before. In re KARLSON (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963).

Consider claims 2 and 23. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the touch screen 38 with a small touch screen and a touch pad so as reduce manufacturing cost of the device. However, such a modification would have resulted to a touch screen with a small size.

Consider claims 3 and 22. The device of Boesen includes character recognition (column 4 lines 53-57).

Consider claim 4. The second segment in the device of Boesen includes a plurality of buttons (22) overlaying the portion of the display assembly.

Consider claims 5-7. Boesen further teaches to provide additional function buttons or other inputs (column 3 lines 51-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Boesen's device to include other known input functions such as multi- directional member, touch pad as suggested by Boesen so as to provide the user additional input functions.

The device of Boesen includes a front shell (portion of 4), a midframe (portion of 38), a bottom shell (portion of 24), a first rail and a second rail, a first connecting member and a second connecting member to enable the second segment slide to the first segment (see figures 6 and 7). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill

Art Unit: 2675

in the art at the time of the invention to housing the rails and connecting members in two side surface, the back surface, or other places of the mobile device since the device would function equally well with the rails and connecting members locating in any places (as recited in claims 8-18, 24-26, 30-37, 40). Furthermore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use additional rails (as recited in claim 38-39) in the device of Boesen so as to enable easy moving of the two segments.

Consider claims 41, 42. Boesen discloses a mobile device having a first segment with a first input feature (the touch panel section 38), a second segment with a second input feature (keypad section 22) moveably coupled to the first segment to move between a contracted position having a reduced length (as shown in Fig.9) and an extended position having a maximum length (as shown in Fig.7) along one axis; a display assembly provided by the first segment', wherein the second segment overlays a portion of the first segment when the second segment is in the contracted position so as to reduce a length of the mobile device (see column 5 lines 23-40 and Figure 7). Furthermore, Boesen includes a pivotable mechanism to allow the user to adjust the angle between the first segment and second segment. However, this function is only for enabling the user to use the device in a manner as a phone handset, and the pivoting operation is performed after the sliding operation, wherein the pivotable mechanism is operative independently from the operation of the sliding operation. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to eliminate such a pivotable mechanism in the device of Boesen so as to provide a device with less parts

and a simple operation. Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if remaining elements perform same functions as before. In re KARLSON (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963).

Consider claim 43. The second segment has a plurality of buttons (22).

Consider claim 44. In one of the embodiment (as shown in Fig.8), Boesen further teaches that the first segment having a reduced section (28) that has a lesser thickness than the remainder of the first portion (24) so as to allow a portion of the first segment being easily accessible from the same surface level as the second surface level while in the contacted position, but still having the advantage of a reduce the length of the mobile device. Obviously, the portion of the first segment being overlaid by the second segment could have varied from none to full length dependent on user's choice, a longer overlaid portion would have lead to a smaller size of the device, while a shorter overlaid portion would have provided more input functions to the user.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 7/11/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to applicant's arguments with respect to the limitation of the use of a pivotable mechanism, note that Boesen includes a pivotable mechanism to allow the user to adjust the angle between the first segment and second segment. However, this function is **only for enabling the user to use the device in a manner as a phone handset, and the pivoting operation is performed after the sliding operation,**

wherein the pivotable mechanism is operative independently from the operation of the sliding operation. Applicant's allegation that "one segment of that configuration must pivot in order to place the segment in the extended position" is incorrect. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to eliminate such a pivotable mechanism in the device of Boesen so as to provide a device with less parts and a simple operation. Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if remaining elements perform same functions as before. In re KARLSON (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963).

As to applicant's arguments regarding the new limitation, note that Boesen teaches that the second segment moveably coupled to the first segment between a contracted position having a reduced length (as shown in Fig.9) and an extended position having a maximum length (as shown in Fig.7) along one axis.

The remainder of the pertinent topics for argument are present in the appropriate rejections above.

Conclusion

7. This is a RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/932,213. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2675

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-7667. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz, can be reached at 571-272-3638.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

571-273-8300

Art Unit: 2675

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kent Chang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2675

kc

2/25/06